



2823

00862.022498

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: )  
: Examiner: B. Kebede  
TAKAO YONEHARA, ET AL. )  
: Group Art Unit: 2823  
Application No.: 10/059,144 )  
: Filed: January 31, 2002 )  
: For: METHOD OF )  
MANUFACTURING )  
THIN-FILM )  
SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE : October 6, 2005

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE  
AND  
REQUEST TO WITHDRAW ERRONEOUS OFFICE ACTION

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action mailed September 20, 2005. The Office Action indicates that the Response to Election of Species Requirement dated June 30, 2005 was non-responsive to the prior Office Action. In fact, as detailed below, the June 30, 2005 Response was fully responsive to the prior Office Action. Accordingly, withdrawal of the instant Office Action is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that the June 30, 2005 Response was fully responsive since a proper election was made. Applicants elected Species IV without traverse, and included a list of claims believed to be readable upon the elected species. The fact that the Examiner disagrees with Applicants as to which claims are readable upon the elected species does not make the reply non-responsive.

This matter was brought to the attention of the Examiner in a telephone conversation on October 6, 2005. The Examiner agreed to withdraw the instant Office Action and issue an Office Action on the merits. Accordingly, such action is respectfully requested.

The instant Office Action states that Claims 8 and 15 do not read on elected Species IV. This statement is respectfully traversed.

The invention provides for a separation step, a chip forming step, and a removing step. For ease of discussion, these three steps will be referred to as **S**, **C**, and **R**.

As set forth in the previous Office Action, Species IV is drawn to a process that requires a chip forming step before the removing step. This can be represented by **C--R**.

Claim 8 recites that the chip forming step is executed after the separation step. This can be represented by **S--C**. Claim 8 depends from Claim 1, which recites that the removing step is after the separation step. This can be represented by **S--R**. Thus, Claim 8 covers **S--C--R** and **S--R--C**. Accordingly, Claim 8 is believed to read on elected Species IV (**C--R**) as well as on Species I (**S--C**) and on Species III (**R--C**).

Claim 15 recites that the separation step is executed after the chip forming step. This can be represented by **C--S**. Claim 15 also depends from Claim 1, which, as

discussed above, can be represented by S--R. Thus, Claim 15 covers C--S--R.

Accordingly, Claim 15 is believed to read on elected Species IV (C--R) as well as on Species II (C--S).

In view of the foregoing, examination of Claims 8 and 15 is respectfully requested.

It is further respectfully requested that the election of species requirement be withdrawn in its entirety, for the reasons set forth in the June 30, 2005 Response.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Damond E. Vadnais  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 52,310

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 103168v1